

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

This paper is presented in response to the non-final official action dated June 29, 2010, wherein (a) claims 1-28 were pending, (b) claim 12 was objected to, (c) claims 1-28 were rejected for indefiniteness, (d) claims 1-5, 7, and 12-14 were rejected as being anticipated by Cooper, (e) claims 6 and 8-10 were rejected under as being obvious over Cooper, (f) claim 11 was rejected as being obvious over Cooper in view of Belvedere, (g) claims 15-18 were rejected as being obvious over Cooper in view of Fillebrown, (h) claims 19-21 were rejected as being obvious over Cooper in view of DiRe, and (i) claims 22-28 were rejected as being obvious over Cooper in view of DiRe and Hayduk.

By the foregoing, claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 14, 16, and 19 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found at description paragraphs [0062-0067] and elsewhere in the original specification and drawing figures. Claim 2 is canceled. Thus, claims 1 and 3-28 remain pending and at issue. Claims 1 and 12 are independent.

In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Objection to claim 12 under 37 CFR 1.75(c)

Claim 12 was objected to for depending from any preceding claim (claims 1-11). Claim 12 is amended to be independent. Reconsideration withdrawal of the objection is solicited.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-28 under §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-28 were rejected under §112, second paragraph for reciting “and/or” in claims 1, 12, 14, 16, and 19. These claims are amended to delete “and/or” and recite either “and” or “or.” Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is solicited.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7, and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claim 2 is canceled. The anticipation rejections of claims 1, 3-5, 7, and 12-14, all based on Cooper, are respectfully traversed; reconsideration is requested.

Cooper does not describe an interface unit having a processing unit that includes four conversion blocks as recited in amended claim 1. In particular, amended claim 1 recites that a first conversion block converts an analog video input signal into a digital input signal and passes the digital input signal to a second conversion block. The second conversion block freezes, mirrors, quads, or deinterlaces the digital input signal and passes the digital input signal to one of a third conversion block or a fourth conversion block. The third conversion block converts the digital input signal to a first PC standard output signal, and the fourth conversion block for converts the digital input signal to a second PC standard output signal.

Cooper also describes an interface unit (*i.e.*, a universal docking station or “UDS”), but does not describe that the UDS includes a processing unit with four conversion blocks as recited in amended claim 1. While Cooper’s UDS includes computer processors for image capture and manipulation (para. [0027]) as well as digital to analog and analog to digital converters (para. [0048]), these processors and converters do not constitute the four specific conversion blocks recited by amended claim 1. Furthermore, Cooper does not describe analog input that proceeds from the first conversion block to the second conversion block, and finally to the third or fourth conversion block as recited by amended claim 1. Because Cooper does not describe the processing unit including four conversion blocks as recited by amended claim 1, Cooper cannot anticipate amended claim 1. Cooper also does not describe the recitations of amended claim 12. At least for these reasons, claim 1 and dependent claims 3-5 and 7 as well as claim 12 and dependent claims 13-14 are allowable and an indication to that effect is solicited.

V. Rejection of Claims 6, 8-11, and 15-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The obviousness rejections of claims 6, 8-11, and 15-28, all based on Cooper in various combinations with Belvedere, Fillebrown, Dire, and Hayduk, are respectfully traversed; reconsideration is requested.

Each of claims 6, 8-11, and 15-28 depend from claim 1 or 12, respectively. For the reasons discussed above, claims 1 and 12 are allowable over Cooper. None of Belvedere, Fillebrown, Dire, and Hayduk teach or suggest the elements of amended claims 1 and 12 that Cooper does not. Therefore, because claims 6, 8-11, and 15-28 depend from an allowable base claim, these claims are also allowable and an indication to that effect is solicited.

VI. Conclusion

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of all claims 1 and 3-28 are solicited.

Should the examiner wish to discuss the foregoing or any matter of form in an effort to advance this application toward allowance, he is urged to telephone the undersigned at the indicated number.

Dated: September 24, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Andrew R. Smith

Registration No.: 62,162

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP

233 S. Wacker Drive

6300 Willis Tower

Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357

(312) 474-6300

Attorney for Applicant